



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

one. The next thing to be done was to strike out the table of contents which follows the dedicatory epistle, and to print a new one. And here occur some marks of confusion; for the treatise before the omitted epistle commencing p. 229, the next following is marked p. 225. We cannot say whether this is a mere misprint for 245, or whether it was, as Mr. Mendham supposes, designed to raise a suspicion as to the accuracy of the printers, and so enable some of the other strange things in these volumes to escape notice. The next part that had to be cut out was a portion of the preface in which Bigot had given an account of this epistle of Chrysostom, and of the manner in which he had found it. The preface is not paged, but the fraud may be traced by the printers' signatures at the bottom of the pages, one leaf being substituted for two marked with the signatures *ij*, *i ij*. Mr. Mendham describes a curious circumstance by which the fraud in his copy is exposed. It would naturally happen that the leaves which were printed in order to be substituted for the matter cut out would be fresher than the rest, and would run the risk of being, what is called, *set off* upon the next page, if placed in contact too early with it. Now in Mr. Mendham's copy this very thing has occurred, and the substituted leaf is set off, but not upon the pages before and after, as would be the case if the impression had taken place during the binding of the volume. It is set off upon two other leaves, also newly substituted, but which occur in quite different places in the bound volume, though when the work lay in sheets, the newly printed sheets were naturally placed together. We now come to the epistle itself. It originally commenced p. 236, and finished p. 244. When it was left out, since p. 236 was the second side of a leaf it became necessary to print this leaf over again, in order to retain the conclusion of the treatise immediately preceding. And it was thought advisable to make *here* the necessary advance of the pages, as being the place where it might have the best chance of escaping notice. The last page but one being 234, the careless printer mistakes the middle number, and prints the new page 245, while there is nothing to excite suspicion of any designed alteration, since this new page reads quite consecutively to that before it. Something else had to be done, however; for though the omission of the ten pages had been now smoothed over, there was still an awkwardness about the signatures at the bottom of the sheets, the next treatise commencing with the signature *Hh ij*, the signatures *Hh* and *Hhij* being in the cancelled matter. To cover this over, a new leaf is printed, containing nothing but a general title of what follows, and bearing the signature *Hh*, so that one who did not look very closely might easily suppose all to be right. Some other changes had to be made in the index at the end of the volume, but we need not go into further details, as we have sufficiently shown the pains that were taken to silence poor St. Chrysostom. Unfortunately, so much pains were not rewarded with the success they deserved; for M. Bigot, who was an honest man, had made no secret of his discovery, but had communicated it several years before to many of his literary friends. He had, for instance, advised one of his Roman Catholic friends who was engaged in controversy with the Protestant Claude, when pressed with this passage, not to defend himself, as Cardinal Perron had done, by accusing Martyr of forgery, assuring him that this defence was not tenable. The fact of Bigot's discovery had been publicly announced about ten years before, and very many had been informed that this long-looked for epistle was to appear in Bigot's forthcoming volume. Great, then, was the disappointment when it was sought there in vain, and the ugly gap of ten pages could not long escape observation. Within less than two years the whole story was exposed by Peter Allix in an expostulation prefixed to a work of Anastasius edited by him. And within two or three years more the exposure was made thoroughly complete by Archbishop Wake, who had in some way got hold of the cancelled leaves of Bigot's edition, and published the whole, carefully marking the line and page where they had originally stood in Bigot's edition before its mutilation. The epistle had also been published by Stephen Le Moine, and it was published again with Bigot's preface by Basnage at Rotterdam. So much publicity was thus given to the epistle within a couple of years, that it was found hopeless to suppress it, and in another year or two the Jesuit Hardouin published it again, and, courageously endeavoured to show that it contained nothing but good orthodox Roman Catholic doctrine. The Benedictine editors also include it in their edition of Chrysostom's works, though apparently not feeling very confident in the success of Hardouin's vindication, they think it better to have two strings to their bow, and make a fight in defence of the position that the epistle was not written by St. Chrysostom. It is true that we have all the reasons for believing it to be St. Chrysostom's that we have for attributing to him many others of the works which bear his name, viz., that the manuscript ascribes the work to him, and that the epistle to Cæsarius is quoted as Chrysostom's by several ancient authors; nor would it probably have entered into the heads of the editors to deny its having sprung from Chrysostom, if it had not been for the very

unpleasant doctrine which he teaches. It would lengthen this article too much if we were here to proceed to a discussion of the authorship of the epistle, and the inferences to be drawn as to the writer's doctrine; but we hope to devote an article next month to this subject. Meanwhile, we have given a specimen how Roman Catholic divines try to muzzle a Father when he attempts to say anything they don't like.

THE INDELIBLE CHARACTER OF HOLY ORDERS. No. II.

In our last number we proposed the question, whether the ministry instituted by Christ in His Church be "an office" to be fulfilled, or whether it consist in an operation or indelible "character" or mark produced by ordination in the soul of the ordained.

There are other important questions respecting that ministry, but we selected this question for consideration because it is most important in itself, and because it is a key to the solution of other questions.

If the ministry be an office which Christ has given to man to perform, as Christ has directed, then ministers are to be regarded according as they perform their office, and are to be followed as they follow Christ. But if the power of orders is valid, even when used in opposition to God Himself, then ministers will be obeyed and followed, even when they abuse their office, and pervert it to hinder the work of Christ.

We cannot now stop to justify further our selection of "The indelible character of Holy Orders" as our present subject: we will repeat the statement of Archbishop Devoti, and then proceed to contrast with it the laws and canons of the Church for 1200 years.

Devoti says—"Ordination is valid by whatever Bishop it may be granted, who has the power annexed to character. Therefore ordinations are valid and firm (*ratæ, firmæ sunt*) though made by a Bishop who is a heretic, a schismatic, excommunicated, suspended, even by one who has renounced at once his place and dignity;" and this is held by Roman Catholics to be the proper consequence of the decrees of the Council of Trent on Holy Orders.

We proceed now to show what ancient Fathers, Popes, and Councils thought of this matter.

The famous case of Novatian, in the year 251, affords the earliest decision we can find of this question.

Fabian, Bishop of Rome, having died, Cornelius was afterwards elected and consecrated. Novatian was afterwards consecrated Bishop of Rome by three canonical Bishops, holding sees in Italy. Upon this St. Cyprian wrote, "that he cannot have ecclesiastical ordination who does not hold the unity of the Church . . . and since after the first there cannot be a second, whoever is made after the one who alone ought to be, he is now not the second, but none. . . . Novatian is not a Bishop."

No judgment ever had greater weight in the Church than this. It was an acknowledged maxim of Church law for more than ten centuries after. We have copied it from the Decretum of Gratian, which from 1152 to the Reformation, and long after, was the great authority in the Latin Church. Caus. VII, 91 c. 5 and 6.

Yet, according to Devoti, the ordination of Novatian was valid, and he had the order of a Bishop, and power to exercise it.

The first GENERAL COUNCIL (Nice) re-affirmed the principle that Cyprian had laid down. "That is quite clear, that if any one is made a Bishop without the consent of the metropolitan, this great Synod determines that he ought not to be a Bishop."

The 9th canon of Nice declares that if any were ordained without due examination, and have confessed "that men acting on motives contrary to the canons laid hands on them (in ordination), the canon does not admit such; for the Catholic Church does not defend what is blameable."

The 10th canon of Nice orders that if any of those who have fallen back to idolatry should be ordained through the ignorance or dissimulation of the ordainers, when it was known, they should be "wiped out" of the list of the clergy (*καθαίρονται*).

The 16th canon of Nice declares that if a clergyman, subject to one Bishop, shall be ordained (to a higher order) by another Bishop, such ordination shall be void;—"ordinationis hujus modi irrita erit." (*ἀκυροῦς ἐστὶν ἡ χειροτονία*).

The 18th canon of Antioch provides, that if a Bishop go to another diocese to ordain, unasked, such ordinations shall be void—"irrita."—*ἀκυρα*.

By the 19th canon of Antioch, if a Bishop be ordained without the Bishops of the province, "such ordination

shall have no force," (*non valere ordinationem*)—*μηδὲν ἰσχυρὴν τὴν χειροτονίαν*.

This was to prevent surreptitious hole-and-corner ordinations—not to invalidate what might be necessary in times of persecution.

The second GENERAL COUNCIL (Constantinople) affords a remarkable and decisive case:

The See of Constantinople was vacant; Gregory Nazianzen was elected; he renounced the office on account of the opposition got up against him. Nectarius was then elected; but the party who opposed Gregory attempted irregularly to intrude Maximus Cynicus, an Egyptian philosopher, into that see. Sozomen, the ecclesiastical historian, thus relates the fact of his ordination:—"The Bishops who had come (to the Council) from Egypt, by a stealthy ordination, had consecrated him Bishop of the city of Constantinople."

The fact is clear that Maximus was consecrated by Bishops who had valid episcopal orders themselves; but who acted wrong in so consecrating him. The Church of Rome now holds that one so consecrated is a Bishop indeed, and that those ordained by him are priests, and can never cease to be priests, and that their acts are necessarily valid. But let us see what was the decision of the GENERAL COUNCIL of Constantinople in their 4th canon.

"Concerning Maximus Cynicus, and the disorder committed respecting him in Constantinople; that Maximus neither became nor is a Bishop, nor are those by him ordained in any rank of the clergy; all things, both those done concerning him and those done by him, being invalidated."

How little notion had this General Council of the "indelible character" and the necessary effect of ordination when performed by those who have "the power of order!" They clearly thought that ordination conferred by Bishops in the communion of the Church was worth nothing, and conferred nothing, and was, in fact, wholly void and ineffectual, when used contrary to the purpose for which Christ established a ministry in the Church.

The 1st canon of the THIRD GENERAL COUNCIL (Ephesus) pronounces any Archbishop who holds the doctrine of Celestius (denying the necessity of the Grace of God) to be deprived of his power as Metropolitan, "thenceforward excluded by the Synod from all ecclesiastical communion, and remaining without the power of effecting anything." (*ἀνεκκλητος ὑπάρχων*).—Justell. et Voell. 59.

Canon 2 declares that those Bishops who adhere to the doctrines of Celestius or Nestorius are "wholly outside of the Priesthood" (*ἀλλοτριούς εἶναι τῆς ὑπερσύνης*).—Justell. et Voell. 59.

The FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL (Chalcedon), in its 6th canon, forbids that any person should be ordained who was not first nominated or appointed to some church in which he should officiate, and "the Holy Synod has decreed to hold such ordination of no effect." (*ἀκυρον*).—Justell. et Voell. p. 63.

Space utterly fails us to give all the various proofs we have collected. We have, therefore, confined ourselves to give a few of the proofs from each of those FOUR GENERAL COUNCILS which Pope Gregory the Great declared that he held, as he did the four Gospels.

Clearly the Fathers of those Councils were utterly ignorant of the monstrous doctrine that orders given in heresy, in schism, in opposition to the purpose of God, and to the laws of the Church, were yet of necessity valid if given by Bishops, who themselves had once received the power of order. Clearly they thought that orders given even by those who had the power of orders, but who used it to defeat the object of the ministry, were utterly invalid, and should be declared by the Church so to be. Clearly the Fathers of these great General Councils were not "Roman Catholics" in the modern sense, as respects holding the modern doctrine of Rome about the "Sacrament of order."

We must now leave the early ages, and show how long the primitive doctrine remained in the Church, and how late it was before the modern doctrine of the "indelible character," and its "necessary effect," came to be established in the Church of Rome itself.

We have already shown that the doctrine of St. Cyprian held its place in the Decretum of Gratian, in the twelfth and following centuries; we will give some further passages from the Decretum.

The Decretum contains a Decree of Pope Nicholas II., A.D. 1059, by which decree the election of Popes was governed; its authority, therefore, cannot be questioned. In that decree Pope Nicholas II. quotes, as undeniable, from Pope Leo I., the following principles:—"No reason permits that they should be reckoned among Bishops who have neither been elected by the clergy, nor asked for by the people, nor consecrated by the Comprovincial Bishops,

* Devoti Jus Can. Vol. ii, 167. Rome 1837.

* Nec habet ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui ecclesiam non tenet unitatem . . . et quum post primum secundum esse non possit, quilibet post eum, qui solus esse debet, factus est, non jam secundum ille, sed nullus est. . . . Novatianus episcopus non est."

* Illud autem omnino manifestum est, quod si quis primum sententiam metropolitani factus sit episcopus, hunc Magna Synodus statuit non oportere esse episcopum. (ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὤρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον).—Can. vi. Niccen. Bib. Justell. et Voell. 31.

* . . . eis confectis, homines contra canonem moiti, manus imposuerunt, tales canon non admittit; quod enim reprehensibile est, Catholica ecclesia non defendit."

* B. B. Justell. et Voell. 32.

* Bib. Justell. et Voell. 46.

* The same, 47.

* Episcopi qui ex Egypto adveniant, furtiva ordinatione episcopum Constantinopolitanæ urbis sacraverant.—Sozomen Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. c. 9.

* Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ κυνικοῦ, καὶ τὰς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινοπόλει γενομένης: ὥς μὴτε Μαξίμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μὴτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτὸν χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οὐλοῦντοτε βαθμῇ κληρῶν, παντῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυροῦντων.—4th Canon, C. P. Bib. Justell. et Voell. 56.

with the consent of the Metropolitan."—*Distinction, xxiii. c. 1.*

Our readers may remember some late cases, in which the Pope set aside those elected by the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland, and appointed Roman Catholic Bishops who were neither "elected by the clergy, nor asked for by the People, nor ordained by the Bishops of the Province;" and who, therefore, according to Pope Leo I. and Pope Nicholas II. can with no reason be reckoned among the Bishops.

Gratian took the following from a decree of Pope Urban in the Placentine Synod:—"We judge that ordinations are void which were made by leaders of heresy, excommunicated by name, and by those who have invaded the sees of Catholic Bishops yet living." *Caus. IX. qu. i. c. 5.*

Clearly this Pope did not know that ordinations by those who had once received the power of order, though given in heresy, schism, or under excommunication, was necessarily valid, by virtue of the indelible character!

In the year 1130 there were two rival Popes, Innocent II. and Anacletus II. (Peter Leo). Innocent II. at last won the victory, and then, in the second GENERAL COUNCIL of Lateran, A. D. 1139, he made this decree:—"The ordinations made by Peter Leo and other schismatics and heretics, we make void, and pronounce them of no effect."

In the year 1159, or thereabouts, there were THREE rival Popes—Alexander III., Victor IV. (Octavian), Pascal III. (Guido Cremensis), and soon after rose another claimant, Callistus III. (John Abbot of Struma); and when Alexander III. won the day, and beat all his brother Popes, he passed this decree, in the third General Council of Lateran, with this title prefixed:—

"Concerning ABOLISHING the ordinations introduced by the anti-popes:—

"We, renewing that which was done by our predecessor, Innocent, of happy memory, pronounce that ordinations are void which were made by Octavian and Guido, the heresiarchs, and John of Struma, who followed them; and by those who were ordained by them."

This latter decree is in the book of Decretals of Pope Gregory IX. (lib. v. Tit. viii., c. 1.), a book of the very highest authority in the Church of Rome, of which Devoti himself says, "Whatever is comprehended in them makes the law."

These decrees of Pope Innocent II. and Pope Alexander III. were both decrees made by Popes in GENERAL COUNCIL, and ought, therefore, to be infallible. Both these decrees entirely abolish and make void the ordinations of Peter Leo, Octavian, Guido, and John of Struma: no one denies that these four men were all consecrated Bishops, in regular form, by persons who had received episcopal consecration. Yet Pope Innocent II. and Pope Alexander III., and the second and third General Councils of Lateran, made no scruple of declaring that the persons ordained by them were not ordained at all.

It was natural that a Pope who had stood a hard battle with a rival Pope should not admit his rival's ordinations as valid; and considering what the law of the Church had always been, it was reasonable that he should declare his rival's ordinations invalid, provided that he himself were, indeed, the right Bishop of Rome, and the other the wrong one; which is more than we can vouch in every case for the man who had the luck to win.

But the case is clear, that in the 12th century the Popes themselves had not yet conceived the notion that ordinations made in heresy or schism, or under excommunication, by Bishops who had once received the power of order, were necessarily valid. Pope Leo, in the 5th century; Pope Gregory, in the 6th; Pope Nicholas II., in the 11th; Pope Urban II., in the 11th; Pope Innocent II., in the 12th; Pope Alexander III., in the 12th; and the general councils (truly so called) of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and those other general councils (falsely so called) of Lateran II. and Lateran III., all held that such orders were utterly void in themselves, and ought to be so declared by the Church.

That which we are now called on to believe, as part of the infallible doctrine of the Church of Rome, that ordination given in heresy, in schism, or under excommunication, by a Bishop who had once had the "indelible character" impressed on his soul, inherited perhaps through a succession of heretics, or schismatics, is, indeed, a necessary consequence of the decrees of Trent. But it is clearly a modern invention; it does not seem to have gained ground even as an "opinion" until the 13th century; we do not know that it had any authority given to

it in the Church of Rome itself until the Council of Trent. If there be any decree in its favour before the Council of Trent, we request that some of our able Roman Catholic correspondents will point it out to us.

On the one hand we have Pope and General Councils for 1200 years admitting or asserting that ordinations by a consecrated Bishop might be invalid, and that the power of orders might be lost. On the other hand, we have the infallible Council of Trent affirming that the indelible character can never be lost, and can never fail of accomplishing an effect. What difference among men can compare to this, when infallibility changes its mind?

It may seem strange to our readers that the modern Church of Rome, in spite of its own books of canon law, should insist on maintaining that orders among heretics or schismatics may yet be valid. But to us it is not strange; for nothing exalts the power of the ministry so much as this. It amounts to this, that when Christ had ordained a Ministry, He, in fact, parted with His own power, and divested Himself of the rule and government of His own Church: for if the ministers whom He has appointed may set aside His will, and yet continue to exercise supernatural power in His Church, in the very acts which are opposed to His will, then the kingdom is theirs, and not His; and they thenceforth stand in the position of gods upon earth. No room is left to question whether they do right or wrong; although it should appear that they were exalting themselves against God Himself, yet mankind would have nothing for it but to bow down and serve them.

We believe that the doctrine of the "indelible character," and the "necessary effect" of its operation, even in heresy and schism, is essential to the system of the Church of Rome. We believe, that to understand the subordination of the office of the ministry to the work and purpose for which that office was instituted, is essential to the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free. We have therefore given our readers the means to judge whether the doctrine of the modern Church of Rome be indeed the doctrine of the ancient Church; and we trust it may lead to further consideration of the use and purpose of a ministry in the Church of Christ.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

WE respectfully beg to remind our subscribers that their subscriptions are payable in advance. Many seem to forget altogether that such are the terms on which we have undertaken to furnish our paper, though from the very commencement they have been so stated in the heading of every number. The very smallness of the sum, we have no doubt, often leads to the neglect of which we complain, though the unusually low price of the paper, in fact, makes the delay the more embarrassing to the conductors. The stamp duty and paper are extremely heavy items, necessarily paid in advance, and, though 3s. 6d. is a very small sum to individuals, the whole expense of so many thousand copies is very heavy indeed.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MAY 19, 1858.

TIME was when images of the Madonna were believed to have miraculously protected the town and its inhabitants that were happy enough to possess such a palladium. Tempora mutantur. It seems now that it is the people who protect the images; at least so it would appear to be in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, if we are to judge by the following narrative, copied from the *Univers* by the *Tablet*, of 24th April last.

The consternation into which both his Holiness the Pope and the Jesuit Fathers seem to have been thrown, and the popular commotion excited by a mere act of brigandage, among the devout and enlightened image-worshippers of Velletri, would be not a little amusing, as well as edifying, were it not sad to contemplate the state of grovelling ignorance and superstition to which the Italian people seem to have been reduced under

the very eyes of their Ecclesiastical rulers of the Court of Rome.

Riots are doubtless not uncommon in other places, but a religious riot, urged on by distrust of the clergy, and suspicion of their having stolen the idol which was the object of the devout affection of the mob, we really suppose never took place elsewhere than in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome itself.

The following is the narrative transcribed by the *Tablet* from the *Univers* verbatim, merely marking in italics a few lines, which strike us particularly:—

"In the Cathedral of Velletri, near Rome, was an image of the Virgin, nearly covered with gold, and decked out with necklaces, rings, and jewellery, and it was held in great veneration by the people. In the Holy Week it was, according to custom, screened from view by a curtain, and on Holy Thursday some person contrived to steal it. On Good Friday the archpriest of the cathedral received a note thus conceived:—'I, the undersigned, know the thief, and the spot in which is deposited the image of the Madonna, and I will make revelations on three conditions: impunity for myself, the release of my brother, who is to be condemned to death, and a pension of ten crowns a month.—VENDETTA.' The archpriest having ascertained that the image really had been abstracted, communicated the strange epistle to the delegate, Mgr. Giordani. Instead of seeking at once for the writer of the letter, this dignitary applied to Rome for orders, and the Pope, fearing the total loss of the image, and the effect that would be produced amongst the people, resolved that the first condition of the bandit should be accepted, but that the other two should be rejected. Vendetta, having learned this resolution, spread amongst the people of Velletri the news of the robbery of the image, which the clergy of the cathedral had kept secret, and he wrote to the clergy that he would be content with impunity for himself, and with 500 crowns paid down. On Saturday the people went en masse to the church, and waited with anxiety for the arrival of that part of the service in which the crucifixes and images are uncovered; but the veil which had covered the image of the Madonna was not removed. On Sunday the people again went to the church, but, as the image was not displayed, they became excited, and murmured; and at length some of them got on the altar, and tore down the curtain. The rumour was then spread by the friends of Vendetta that it was the Jesuits who had stolen the Madonna; and the excited people, believing the falsehood, broke into the convent occupied by the Jesuits, which is adjacent to the cathedral, and, with cries of 'La Madonna nostra!' completely sacked it, and ill-treated the reverend fathers. Shortly after, the Suffragan Bishop ascended the pulpit, and exhorted the people who remained in the church to be calm, but they would not listen to him. There is no garrison except ten or twelve veterans in the town, so that no opposition could be made to the mob. When the bishop descended from the pulpit, a scarcely credible scene occurred; the brigand Vendetta, armed with a poniard, ascended it, and thus addressed the people: 'Be patient! The good Fathers are innocent! It is I who stole the Madonna! But I will only restore it when the government, to whom I grant a delay till Monday evening, shall have consented to the compact I have proposed to it. Be calm, therefore, and shout no more! I warn you, in conclusion, that my companions are armed as well as I!' Orders were issued to despatch a troop of gendarmes on horseback and a company of Swiss infantry to Velletri to establish order. Upon the authorities firmly refusing to accede to the demands of the bandit, he agreed to restore the statue without any other condition than immunity to himself. The image has been brought back in procession to the Church of St. Clement, where it is again exposed to public veneration. Vendetta, who is a man of great energy, and no ordinary intelligence, is captured, and now lies incarcerated at Rome."

We strongly suspect that the statement, that the bandit (to whom immunity was promised under the direct orders of the Pope) is now incarcerated at Rome, is incorrect, and certainly no such statement was made when the story first appeared in the *Univers*, from which it was copied into the *Times* Newspaper, on 16th April last. Whether the necklaces, rings, and jewellery, and gold, with which the image was bedecked, were also restored, does not appear; but that the brigand actually ascended the pulpit, from which the Bishop had just come down, because the people would not listen to him, and defended the Jesuit fathers by publicly confessing that he himself was the thief, appears to be quite beyond doubt. The Jesuits were, we suppose, peculiar favourites of Vendetta, and will, no doubt, do him the good office, in return, of recommending him to the tender

"Nulla ratio sinit, ut inter episcopos habeantur, qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebis expetiti, nec a provincialibus episcopis cum Metropolitanis iudicio consecrati."

"Ordinationes, que ab heresiarchis nominatim excommunicatis facte sunt, et ab eis qui Catholicorum adhuc viventium episcoporum sedes invaserunt, irritas esse iudicamus." This Pope gives a partial dispensation on account of great necessity then existing, but forbids that this should be a precedent against the canons in future.

"Ordinationes factas a Petro Leone et aliis schismaticis et hereticis evasimus, et irritas esse censuimus.—*Con. Lat. II. c. 20. Labbe and Coss. x. 109.*

"De abolenda ordinationibus ab antipapis introductis.

Quod a predecessoribus nostris felicis memorie Innocentio factum est, innovamus, ordinationes ab Octaviano et Guidone heresiarchis necnon et Joanne Strumensi, qui eos secutus est, factas, et ab ordinatis ab eis, irritas esse censuimus.—*Con. Lat. III., c. 2. Labbe and Coss. vol. x. 158.*

"Quidquid igitur in his comprehenditur, legem facit.—*Devoti, Jua. Can. Vol. I., p. 379.*